

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION**

| | | |
|----------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| 7X CATTLE CO., LLC, | § | |
| | § | |
| Plaintiff, | § | |
| | § | |
| v. | § | Case No. 6:22-cv-396-JDK-KNM |
| | § | |
| DANIEL BRANDSTADT, et al., | § | |
| | § | |
| Defendants. | § | |
| | § | |

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF UNITED
STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Before the Court is Defendant Pinehurst Partners I, LLC’s (“Pinehurst”) motion for summary judgment (Docket No. 93), Plaintiff 7X Cattle Company, LLC’s (“7X”) motion for summary judgment against Defendant Pinehurst (Docket No. 95), and 7X’s motion for summary judgment against Defendant Daniel Brandstadt (Docket No. 96). The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge K. Nicole Mitchell for findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for disposition. On February 28, 2025, Judge Mitchell issued a Report and Recommendation (Docket No. 176), recommending that Pinehurst’s motion for summary judgment (Docket No. 93) be granted as to 7X’s tortious interference with contract claim (Count 6) and denied as to 7X’s claims for knowing participation in breach of fiduciary duty (Count 3) and tortious interference with prospective business relations (Count 7). Judge Mitchell further recommended that 7X’s motion for summary judgment

against Pinehurst (Docket No. 95) and motion for summary judgment against Brandstadt (Docket No. 96) both be denied. No written objections have been received.


This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo only if a party objects within fourteen days of service of the Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a de novo review, the Court examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), *superseded on other grounds by statute*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).

This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo only if a party objects within fourteen days of service of the Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a de novo review, the Court examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), *superseded on other grounds by statute*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendations, the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions contrary to law. Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendations of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 176) as the findings of this Court. Pinehurst's motion for summary judgment (Docket No. 93) is **GRANTED in part** and **DENIED in part**. The motion is **GRANTED** as to 7X's tortious interference

with contract claim (Count 6) and **DENIED** as to 7X's remaining claims. 7X's motion for summary judgment against Pinehurst (Docket No. 95) and motion for summary judgment against Brandstadt (Docket No. 96) are both **DENIED**.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this 18th day of **March, 2025**.


JEREMY D. KERNODLE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE